



RESEARCH ARTICLE

INSTRUCTIONS AND GRAMMATICAL DEVELOPMENT IN HINDI AS A THIRD LANGUAGE: A STUDY OF LEARNING STYLE DIFFERENCES AMONG ELEMENTARY LEARNERS

*Ranu Mondal

Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Banasthali Vidyapith, Rajasthan, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 25th November, 2025
Received in revised form
20th December, 2025
Accepted 18th January, 2026
Published online 27th February, 2026

Keywords:

Instruction, Blended Instructional Strategy, non-native speakers, learning style, grammar, Hindi language.

*Corresponding author: Ranu Mondal

ABSTRACT

For the present study two types of instructions were selected, one is Blended Instructional Strategy (BIS) and Traditional Instructional Strategy (TIS). The main objective of the study is to find out which instruction is more effective on the learning of Grammar of Hindi language among the non-native speakers of Hindi. This study also aimed to know the impact of instruction on various learning styles possess by non-native speakers. Though this study is experimental in nature a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest group design was selected for this study. Overall, 217 non-native speakers of Hindi, studying in class VIII had participated in the study. The experimental group incorporated 107 students and the control group had 110 students. The experimental group was taught through Blended Instructional Strategy and the control group was taught through Traditional Instructional Strategy. The findings of the study depict that Blended Instructional Strategy was more effective when compared with Traditional Instructional Strategy on the Grammar of non-native speakers. The study signifies that Blended Instructional Strategy was equally effective on all the learning styles i.e active-reflective, verbal, reflective-intuitive and sequential-global except the balance (combination of active and reflective) and visual learning style.

Copyright©2026, Ranu Mondal, 2026. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Ranu Mondal. 2026. "Instructions and Grammatical Development in Hindi as a Third Language: A Study of Learning Style Differences among Elementary Learners". *International Journal of Current Research*, 18, (02), 36297-36302.

INTRODUCTION

When it comes to language education native speakers and non-native speakers are the two major types of learners (Cook, 2003). Native speakers are those who have acquired a particular language through exposure to it from birth, and they have an intuitive understanding of the grammar and syntax of the language whereas non-native speakers are those who acquire a language as a second and foreign language after acquiring first language or mother tongue. According to the theory of universal grammar proposed by Noam Chomsky claimed that all human poses an innate language faculty that allows an individual to acquire language known as language acquisition device (LAD). He had also stated that non-native speakers can also acquire any language just as well as native speakers. If they are exposed to language and provide access to the necessary resources for the language acquisition (Berwick, R.C. & Chomsky, N. 2016). The cognitive linguistic theory claims that schema plays a vital role in language acquisition of non-native speakers (Bartlett, 1932). Language in general is a combination of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. Grammar is a type of conceptual schema, which governs rules in any language. Rules in the aspect of language learning denotes 'statement of relationship that exist between two or more concepts or phenomena' (Romiszowski, 1988). For the present Grammar refers to the basic principles and rules for basic sentence formation of Hindi language, which a non-native speakers of Hindi were learning.

Blended Instructional Strategy (BIS) and Traditional Instructional Strategy (TIS) were the independent variables of the study. For this study blended instructional strategy refers to an instruction which combines behaviourism, cognitivism, constructivism and information communication technology. Traditional instructional strategy is instruction with chalk and talk.

Review of Related Research Literature: Various researches have been conducted on the non-native speakers. Native language of a learner always helps in new language acquisition. Logo et al in 2019 in their study concluded that task of reading comprehension influence the knowledge of grammar among the native and non-native speakers of German language. Huang, L. (2022) examine the effect of inductive and deductive method of teaching grammar of Chinese language as non-native speakers they concluded that both inductive and deductive method has their own advantage and disadvantages. To select a particular method depend on the certain variables of language, like what kind of grammar is to be taught? The study also suggested that for teaching simple and intuitive grammar content inductive method should be used whereas deductive method of teaching grammar can be fruitful for complex grammar content. With the passage of time pedagogical shift have been taken place for teaching the Grammar content of language. Student have become the epicentre of teaching and learning process. Yang, Y. (2023)

conducted a study to observed the grammar teaching of English language to the non-native speakers. The study reveal that guided discovery method based constructivist approach is the highly used method of teaching English grammar to the non-native speakers in China. Similar study was conducted in Sweden by freeman. N. (2023) to observe the approaches, method of teaching English grammar to the non-native speakers of English in upper secondary schools. The study concluded that English teacher preferred to teach English in grammar to the non-native speakers through interactive methods that includes participation of non-native speakers in the form of Task-Based Method and communication language teaching. Grammar provides proficiency to language. Grammar means 'set of rules' or principles for choosing words and arranging them to make a meaningful sentence. Principles of language play an important role in learning a new language or non-native speakers (Wang,F, 2010). Souisa .T.R .et.al. (2020). conducted a study to identify the most popular and least popular method of teaching language principles by teacher who are teaching English to non-native speakers in Ambon, Indonesia. The study followed explanatory mixed approach. Total 63 teachers were selected, the findings of the study revealed that teaching approaches adopted by the teachers for teaching language principle vary from one teacher to another teachers and it is based on the conceptual knowledge of the teachers. The study also reveals that structural context strategy and cooperative learning approach are most frequently employed, but structural context strategy in terms of role-playing the circumstance is less frequently used by teachers. The study also concluded that teaching grammar is a complex process and teachers faced problem while teaching and they considered learning style is one of the reason for so. Hence learning styles of students should be considered while selecting teaching strategy. Iwanek, K.(2015) conducted a survey study to identify the problem faced by Polish and Korean students in learning Hindi as a non-native speakers, in terms of phonetics and grammar. Total 28 Korean and 28 Polish students were selected as a sample. The result of the survey concluded that Hindi phonetics is considered more difficult by Korean students than to Polish students. In terms of grammar the Polish students considered past tense,, passive voice and compound verb as most difficult element of Hindi grammar, while Korean students considered verbs, passive voice and modal verbs structure as hardest elements of Hindi grammar.

Objectives of the Study: The main objective of this study was to study the impact of Blended Instructional Strategy (BIS) and Traditional Instructional Strategy (TIS) on the Grammer of non-native speakers with respect to the learning styles of the non-native speakers i.e sensing-intuitive, visual-verbal, active-reflective and sequential- global.

Following were the four sub-objectives that were developed to help with the main objectives:

- To identify the learning-styles of non-native speakers.
- To determine which instruction is effective on the grammer of non-native speakers.
- To determine which instruction is effective on the grammer of non-native speakers, with the processing dimension of the learning styles.
- To determine which instruction is effective on the grammer of non-native speakers, with the perceptual dimension of the learning styles.

- To determine which instruction is effective on the grammer of non-native speakers, in relation to the input dimension of the learning styles.
- To determine which instruction is effective on the grammer of non-native speakers, in relation to the understanding dimension of the learning styles.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for the present study are as follow:

H₀1 There is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional strategies on the grammer of non-native speakers.

H₀2 There is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional instruction strategies on the grammer of non-native speakers in relation to the processing dimension (active, balance and reflective) of learning styles.

H₀3 There is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional instruction strategies on the grammer of non-native speakers with the perception dimension (Sensing, balance and intuitive) of learning styles.

H₀4 There is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional strategies on the grammer of non-native speakers with the input dimension (visual, balance and verbal) of learning styles.

H₀5 There is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional instruction strategies on the grammer of non-native speakers in relation to the understanding dimension (sequential, balance and global) of learning styles.

METHODOLOGY

For conducting this experimental study pretest-posttest non-equivalent group design was selected. Class VIII students of the West Bengal Board, who are studying Hindi language as a third language formed the sample for this study. In total 217 students were selected and then they were divided into the experimental and control group. The experimental group incorporates 107 students whereas the control group have 110 students. Two tools were used for this study. One is learning style questionnaire by Felder-Soloman (1997), the learning style questionnaire was translated into Bengali the reliability value of the tool was 0.83 with test-retest method. Second tool was a self-made Hindi language achievement test. Two Hindi language achievement test was constructed for this study. A pre-test was constructed to test the entry-level knowledge, and a post-test was constructed to test the effect of instruction on grammer in both groups. The inter-rater reliability score for the pre-test was 85% and 84% for the post-test. The content validity ratio (CVR) was 0.83 and 0.85 for the pre-test and post-test respectively from the scores it was clear that both tests were reliable and valid.

Experimental Intervention: At first, the researchers administered a learning style questionnaire developed by Felder Solomon (1997) on both the experimental and control group with the purpose to identify the learning styles of native

speakers of Hindi. For checking the entry-level knowledge of the student pretest was conducted. Afterward, the experimental group was taught in blended instructional strategy (BIS) and the control group was taught with traditional instruction strategy (TIS) the experimental was conducted for four weeks. After completing the experiment, a post-test was administered to both groups to compare the effect of instructions.

Statistical Technique: For statistical technique, the data was tested to assure homogeneity among variance. For testing homogeneity, F-test and Bartlett's-test test were used. The following tables represent the homogeneity of variance among various groups employed for the study. Table 1 represents the homogeneity among the experimental and control group of non-native speakers. from the table it is clear that both test are homogeneous at 0.05 level of significance. The homogeneity among various groups on the basis of learning styles of non-native speakers have been checked. Table no. 2 denotes the homogeneity among blended instructional strategy (experimental group) and traditional instructional group (control group) in perceptual dimension of non-native speakers i.e sensing, balance (combination of sensing and intuitive) and intuitive learners. The bartlett's test scores of all the three groups is $> .05$, which means the groups are not heterogeneous. Similarly the groups formed on the basis of input dimension, i.e verbal, balanced (combination of verbal and visual) and visual learners among the experimental and control groups were considered in table no. 3. The table values shows that the groups are homogeneous in nature. Table no 4 represents the homogeneity among the processing dimension of learning style among the non-native speakers. the processing dimension consisted of active, balanced (combination of active and reflective) and reflective learners. Lastly the test for homogeneity was conducted for the understanding dimension, i.e sequential, balanced (combination of sequential and global) and global learners. Table no.5 shows that all the groups among the non-native speakers are homogeneous

RESULTS

Learning styles of the non-native speakers: The first objective of this study was to identify the learning styles of the non-native speakers who are studying Hindi as third language in class VIII. Learning styles questionnaire constructed by Felder- soloman (1977) was adopted and translated into Hindi for better comprehension by the learners. The questionnaire was consisted of total 44 questions, 11 questions represents one dimensions of learners. The first dimension is processing dimension which poses question to identify how a particular learners process the received information, under this dimension learners are divided into three types of learning styles, i.e active, balance and reflective. Active learners are those who prefer to engage in hands-on experiences, enjoy group work and collaboration and prefer to work on task with other rather than individually. On the other hand reflective learners are those who take time to process and think about new information, they learn best when they are given the opportunity to reflect on their experience and connect new information to prior knowledge. The numbers of students preferred active, balance and reflective learning style were 31, 45 and 32 in blended instructional strategy and 26, 26 and 57 in traditional instructional strategy respectively. The second dimension is perception dimension which categories learners

as sensing, balanced and intuitive. Sensing learning styles represents those learners who rely on their five senses- sight, hearing, touch, smell and taste to process information, they prefer to focus on concrete facts and details rather than abstract concepts. Intuitive learners prefer to rely in their intuition and look for patterns and connection between concepts. The findings related to perception dimension shows that the number of students preferred sensing, balance and intuitive learning style were 16, 42 and 50 among blended instructional strategy and 49, 43 and 15 among traditional instructional strategy respectively. The third dimension of the learning style questionnaire is input dimension refers to the different modalities and channel through which learners process information and learn. This dimension consist of visual, balanced and verbal learning style. The learners who posses visual learning style learns through visual aids such as diagram, video, chart etc and verbal learner on the other hand prefer to learn through verbal explanation in form of lecture, discussions, debate etc. The data analysed on the basis of learning styles of non-native speakers reflect that the number of students preferred visual, balanced and verbal learning styles were 23, 48 and 37 among blended instructional strategy and 34, 39 and 36 among traditional instructional strategy respectively. The last dimension of Felder- soloman learning style questionnaire was understanding dimension. Sequential, balance and global learners are the types of learning styles comes under understanding dimension. The sequential learners are systematic learners, they involve into the learning process step-by-step and global learners are the opposite of them, they prefer holistic approach to learn new information. the number of students preferred sequential, balanced and global learning styles were 23, 39 and 46 among blended instructional strategy and 40, 40 and 29 among Traditional instructional strategy respectively. The results related to learning styles of non-native speakers were in table no. 6.

Effectiveness of instruction on the grammar: The second objective of this study was to examine to determine the effectiveness of blended instructional strategy and traditional instructional strategy on the grammar of non- native speakers. table 7 shows the obtained 't' value of 5.48 is significant at both 0.01 and 0.05 level of confidence with 215 df. The result shows that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of blended instructional strategy and traditional instructional strategy. Hence the hypothesis formulated based on objective no.2 that 'there is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional strategies on the grammar of non-native speakers' is rejected. The result signifies that non-native taught with blended instructional strategy has learner well the grammar of Hindi language.

Blended and traditional instructional Strategy and Processing Dimension: The third objective of this study was to measure the effectiveness of blended instructional strategy on the grammar of non-native speakers in Hindi language in relation to processing dimension. Table 8 shows the obtained t value for active , balance and reflective learning styles, which is 2.96, .873 and 5.54 respectively. The minimum requires t-value is 1.98 at a 0.05 level of confidence. Hence the groups of active and reflective learners have significant difference between the experimental and control group, which reflect that blended instructional strategy is effective on the non-native speakers with active and reflective learning styles. But the non-native speakers who are categorized as balanced learners(combination of active and reflective) are not benefited

Table 1. Test of homogeneity among experimental and control group

Schema	Group	N	M	SD	F _{max} -test	Bartlett's-test	Remark
Principle	BIS	108	1.94	1.38	1.06	.491	Homogeneous
	TIS	109	1.69	1.30			

*Where BIS= Blended instructional strategy, TIS = Traditional instructional strategy

Table 2. Test for homogeneity of variance of grammer in perception dimension among the non-native speakers

Perception Dimension										
Speakers	Learning styles	School	Group	N	M	SD	Variance	F _{max} -test	Bartlett's-test	Remark
Non-native	Sensing	3	BIS	16	1.88	1.54	2.38	1.1	.595	homogeneous
		4	TIS	49	1.80	1.38	1.91			
	Balance	3	BIS	42	1.82	1.32	1.75	1.1	.531	homogeneous
		4	TIS	43	1.49	1.20	1.44			
	Intuitive	3	BIS	50	2.04	1.41	1.99	1	.990	homogeneous
		4	TIS	15	1.87	1.40	1.98			

*Where BIS= Blended instructional strategy, TIS = Traditional instructional strategy.

Table 3. Test for homogeneity of variance of grammer in input dimension among the non-native speakers

Input Dimension										
Speakers	Learning styles	School	Group	N	M	SD	Variance	F _{max} -test	Bartlett's-test	Remark
Non-native	Visual	3	BIS	23	1.83	1.19	1.42	1.2	.297	homogeneous
		4	TIS	34	1.97	1.46	2.15			
	Balance	3	BIS	48	1.73	1.44	2.07	1.1	.454	homogeneous
		4	TIS	39	1.67	1.28	1.64			
	Verbal	3	BIS	37	2.27	1.40	1.98	1.2	.198	homogeneous
		4	TIS	36	1.44	1.13	1.28			

*Where BIS= Blended instructional strategy, TIS = Traditional instructional strategy.

Table 4. Test for homogeneity of variance of grammer in processing dimension among the non-native speakers

Processing Dimension										
Speakers	Learning styles	School	Group	N	M	SD	Variance	F _{max} -test	Bartlett's-test	Remark
Non-native	Active	3	BIS	31	1.58	1.23	1.51	1.09	.607	homogeneous
		4	TIS	26	1.62	1.35	1.84			
	Balance	3	BIS	45	2.00	1.43	2.09	1.05	.710	homogeneous
		4	TIS	26	2.08	1.35	1.83			
	Reflective	3	BIS	32	2.19	1.44	2.09	1.1	.500	homogeneous
		4	TIS	57	1.69	1.30	1.69			

*Where BIS= Blended instructional strategy, TIS = Traditional instructional strategy.

Table 5. Test for homogeneity of variance of understanding dimension among the non-native speakers

Understanding Dimension										
Speakers	Learning styles	School	Group	N	M	SD	Variance	F _{max} -test	Bartlett's-test	Remark
Non-native	Sequential	3	BIS	23	1.83	1.64	2.69	1.09	.660	homogeneous
		4	TIS	40	1.85	1.51	2.28			
	Balance	3	BIS	39	1.79	1.28	1.64	1.2	.430	homogeneous
		4	TIS	40	1.60	1.12	1.27			
	Global	3	BIS	46	2.11	1.35	1.93	1.08	.501	homogeneous
		4	TIS	29	1.59	1.24	1.53			

*Where BIS= Blended instructional strategy, TIS = Traditional instructional strategy.

Table 6. The learning styles of non-native speakers in different instructional group

Dimensions	Experimental group (BIS)			Control group (TIS)		Total(BIS+TIS)	
	Learning style	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Processing	Active	31	29	26	24	57	26
	Balanced	45	42	26	24	71	33
	reflective	32	29	57	52	89	41
	Total	108	100	109	100	217	100
	Sensing	16	15	49	46	65	30
Perception	Balanced	42	39	43	40	85	39
	Intuitive	50	46	17	14	67	31
	total	108	100	109	100	217	100
	Visual	23	21	34	31	57	26
	Balanced	48	44	39	36	87	40
Input	Verbal	37	35	36	33	73	34
	Total	108	100	109	100	217	100
	Sequential	23	21	40	37	63	29
	Balanced	39	36	40	37	79	36
	Global	46	43	29	26	75	35
Understanding	Total	108	100	109	100	217	100

Table 7 The means of grammar among the experimental group and control group of non-native speakers.

Pair	Instruction	Test	N	Mean	SD	Df	't'-test	p	Remarks
1	BIS (Experimental)	Pre- test	108	1.94	1.38	214	5.06	.000	Significant
		Post- test	108	2.84	1.23				
2	TIS (Control)	Pre-test	109	1.69	1.30	216	.995	.321	Not-Significant
		Post- test	109	1.87	1.37				
3	BIS	Post- test	108	2.84	1.23	215	5.48	.000	Significant
		Post- test	109	1.87	1.37				

Table 8 The mean scores of grammar non-native speakers among processing dimension of learning style

T- Test									
Schema	Perception dimension	Instruction	N	Mean	SD	DF	't'- value	P-value	Remarks
	Active	BIS	31	2.77	1.30	55	2.96	.004	Significant
		TIS	26	1.73	1.34				
Principle	Balance	BIS	45	2.64	1.15	69	.873	.386	Not-Significant
		TIS	26	2.35	1.64				
	Reflective	BIS	32	3.19	1.23	87	5.43	.000	Significant
		TIS	57	1.72	1.22				

Table 9 The mean scores of grammar non-native speakers among perception dimension of learning style

Perception Dimension									
Schema	Processing Dimension	Group	N	M	SD	DF	't'-value	'p'-value	Remarks
	Sensing	BIS	16	3.31	1.44	63	3.40	.001	Significant
		TIS	49	1.92	1.41				
Principle	Balanced	BIS	42	2.67	1.05	83	3.86	.000	Significant
		TIS	43	1.67	1.32				
	Intuitive	BIS	50	2.84	1.28	65	2.59	.012	Significant
		TIS	17	1.93	1.16				

Table 10 The mean scores of principle schema non-native speakers among input dimension of learning style

Input Dimension									
Schema	Processing Dimension	Group	N	M	SD	DF	't'-value	'p'-value	Remarks
	Visual	BIS	23	2.65	1.19	55	1.67	.100	Not-Significant
		TIS	34	2.03	1.48				
Principle	Balanced	BIS	48	2.71	1.20	85	3.27	.002	Significant
		TIS	39	1.82	1.33				
	Verbal	BIS	37	3.14	1.27	71	4.46	.000	Significant
		TIS	36	1.78	1.33				

Table 11. The mean scores of grammar non-native speakers among understanding dimension of learning style

Understanding Dimension									
Schema	Processing Dimension	Group	N	M	SD	DF	't'-value	'p'-value	Remarks
	Sequential	BIS	23	2.74	1.32	61	2.32	.023	Significant
		TIS	40	1.90	1.41				
Principle	Balanced	BIS	39	2.56	1.16	77	2.79	.006	Significant
		TIS	40	1.78	1.31				
	Global	BIS	46	3.13	1.20	73	3.75	.000	Significant
		TIS	29	1.97	1.45				

with blended instructional strategy. Thus hypothesis 'there is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional instruction strategies on the grammar of non-native speakers in relation to the processing dimension (active, balance and reflective) of learning styles' is accepted.

Blended and traditional instructional Strategy and Perception Dimension: The fourth objective of this study was to measure the effectiveness of blended instructional strategy on the grammar of non-native speakers in Hindi language in relation to perception dimension. Table 9 shows the obtained t value for sensing, balance and intuitive learning styles, which is 3.40, 3.86 and 2.59 respectively. The minimum requires t-value is 1.98 at a 0.05 level of confidence. Hence the groups of sensing, balanced and intuitive learners have significant difference between the experimental and control group, which reflect that blended instructional strategy is equally effective

on the non-native speakers with sensing, balanced and intuitive learning styles. Thus hypothesis 'there is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional instruction strategies on the grammar of non-native speakers with the perception dimension (Sensing, balance and intuitive) of learning styles' is rejected.

Blended and traditional instructional Strategy and Input Dimension: The fifth objective of this study was to measure the effectiveness of blended instructional strategy on the grammar of non-native speakers in Hindi language in relation to input dimension. Table 10 shows the obtained t value for visual, balance and verbal learning styles, which is 1.67, 3.27 and 4.46 respectively. The minimum requires t-value is 1.98 at a 0.05 level of confidence. Hence the groups of visual learners are not significant, which reflect that blended instructional strategy is not effective on the non-native speakers with visual learning styles. Where as the balanced and verbal learning

style have significant difference among the experimental and control groups. The results based on the input dimension can be concluded as that blended instructional strategy is effective on the grammar of balanced and verbal learning style but not benefited to the visual learners. Thus hypothesis 'there is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional strategies on the grammar of non-native speakers with the input dimension (visual, balance and verbal) of learning styles' is accepted.

Blended and traditional instructional Strategy(BIS) and Understanding Dimension:

The sixth objective of this study was to measure the effectiveness of blended instructional strategy on the grammar of non-native speakers in Hindi language in relation to perception dimension. Table 9 shows the obtained t value for sequential, balance and global learning styles, which is 2.32, 2.79 and 3.75 respectively. The minimum requires t-value is 1.98 at a 0.05 level of confidence. Hence the groups of sequential, balanced and global learners have significant difference between the experimental and control group, which reflect that blended instructional strategy is equally effective on the non-native speakers with sensing, balanced and intuitive learning styles. Thus hypothesis 'there is no significant difference in the effect of blended and traditional instructional instruction strategies on the grammar of non-native speakers in relation to the understanding dimension (sequential, balance and global) of learning styles' is rejected.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the findings following conclusion have been drawn

- It was found that under processing dimension majority of non-native speakers prefer to be reflective learners (89%). In terms of perception dimension maximum of non-native speakers are considered to be balanced (85%), which means they prefer to perceive the information through both senses and intuition. In input dimension majority of non-native speakers are marked as balanced learners (87%). Which means majority of learners love to receive information in the form of visual and verbal orientation. Under understanding dimension majority of non-native speakers of Hindi prefer to be balanced learner with 79%..
- Blended instructional strategy is more effective on the grammar of non-native speakers of Hindi when compared with traditional instructional strategy.
- Blended instructional strategy is effective on the grammar of active and reflective learners, but not benefited to the balanced learners who prefer to process information actively and reflectively.

- Blended instructional strategy is effective on the grammar of non-native speakers with sensing, balanced and intuitive learning style.
- Blended instructional strategy is effective on the grammar of non-native speakers with balanced (combination of verbal and visual), but not effective for visual learners.
- Blended instructional strategy is effective on the grammar of non-native speakers with sequential, balanced and global learning styles.

Acknowledgement

The research article is based on the data of the author's doctoral research

REFERENCES

- Berwick, R.C. & Chomsky ,N. (2016). Why only us: Language and evolution. MIT Press
- Bartlett 1932 Remembering: A Study in experimental and social psychology. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved 19 July 2022, from <http://archive.org/details/Bartlett1932Remembering>
- Cook, V. (2003). The Changing L1 in the L2 user's mind. *Second Language Research*, 19(4), 368-383. Retrieved from <http://www.viviancook.uk/Writings/Papers/FXintro.htm>.
- Freeman, N. (2023). Teaching L2 grammar: A study of teachers' beliefs on frequency, methods and approaches of teaching English grammar in Swedish schools.
- Huang, L. (2023). Comparing the Deductive Method and Inductive Method of Grammar Teaching for Chinese Senior High School students. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8, 229-237.
- Iwanek, K.(2015). Teaching Hindi to Korean and Polish students. A Contrastive Analysis and Survey Data.
- Lago, S., Stutter Garcia, A., & Felser, C. (2019). The role of native and non-native grammars in the comprehension of possessive pronouns. *Second Language Research*, 35(3), 319–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658318770491>.
- Romiszowski. A. J. (1988). *Designing Instructional System Decision Making in Course Planning and Curriculum Design*. Landon: Routledge Publication. pp- 242-250.
- Souisa .T.R .et.al. (2020). Teachers' strategies on teaching grammar: Facts and expectations of senior high school teachers at Ambon. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*. 9 (4), pp. 1121-1127 ISSN: 2252-8822, DOI: 10.11591/ijere.v9i4.20643.
- Yang, Y. (2023). Research on Grammar Teaching in Senior High School Classes from the Perspective of Constructivism: A Case Study of Nanning No. 15 Middle School. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 6(1), 115-120.
- Wang, F. (2010). The Necessity of Grammar Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 78-81.
